

Language as a Tool of Struggle: A Sociopragmatic Analysis of Demand Statements in Police Reports on Demonstrations

Tri Santoso¹

Hari Kusmanto²

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

²Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

ts675@ums.ac.id

harikusmanto@unesa.ac.id

Abstract

Language in police reports on demonstrations often functions not merely as a neutral record of events but as a strategic device that conveys demands, frames social struggles, and legitimizes authority or resistance. The study employs a descriptive qualitative research method that includes the types of illocutionary acts and social functions of the 39 online news headlines as data. Data were gathered through documentation, observation, and note-taking and were analysed using methods of intralingual matching and pragmatic matching. Results show that the directive illocutionary acts, conveying explicit demands or commands, are dominant (87.18%), followed by expressive acts (7.69%) and assertives (5.13%). Outstanding social functions include investigation on corruption/illegality (48.72%), dismissal/job negotiating (17.95%), protection/rejection of environment/project (7.69%) and other functions (e.g., demand for social justice, demand for lifting the life-level of the public, socialistic critique), ranging from 2.56% to 10.26%). In a global context, these issues are very easy to relate to both for anticorruption and environmental campaigns around the developing world who are fighting the same governance issues in their home countries. Interdisciplinarily, this research adds to the field of linguistics, sociology and communication studies to explain that on-line media language does not work purely as informative, archaical language, but also it works like a strategic device of Indonesia civil movement in order to mobilize society, to stem up a civil advocacy, and influence on public policy in contemporary Indonesia. They reinforce language as a catalyst of social innovation under the democratizing navalieu of democracy and global justice.

Keywords: demand sentences, social function, sociopragmatics, demonstrations, demand statements

INTRODUCTION

Language is used for more than communication per se; it is used to build stories, make demands and deal with power in different domains of life. In advocacy, language is used to influence demands, connect in solidarity, and organize joint action (Lacina & Griffith, 2021). Language serves as a key instrument through which power is negotiated across institutional and non-institutional contexts (Uwen, 2023; House et al., 2024). At the level of organization, those who hold high power may avoid sensitive language in an attempt to manage their image, conflicting with the notion that power is invariably related to dominating speech or aggression (Healey et al., 2023).

Demonstration in Indonesia is also one of the sociopolitical dynamics especially in the period of reform. Protests are a response to government policies seen as unjust or harmful to the community. This is exacerbated by social media and the role of young people in forming political identity and the spread of movements resulting demand for democracy and social justice (Wahyuningroem et al., 2024; Hasfi et al., 2024). Even with the democratization process in Indonesia, state responses to protests are essentially about maintaining capitalism and reflect the undemocratic and profiteering nature of both political and economic power relations (Wischermann et al., 2023). In spite of the shrinking civic space due to polarization and state repression, activists display resilience and creativity in promoting civil rights and democracy, especially in the fields of women's rights and environment (Setiawan & Tomsa, 2023).

Police report data are commonly used in research but are plagued with accessibility, quality, and representational problems. Research suggests that the information is usually difficult to access and the quality varies regarding the inferred source and criteria (i.e., detail, coherence and subjective biases) (Güss et al., 2020; Schade & Thielgen, 2022; Donatz-Fest, 2024). Most notably, data voluntarily supplied to law enforcement agencies is often incomplete and not representative of the phenomenon, biasing and underreporting cases (Finch et al., 2022; Parker, 2022). Police reports may also not capture the same data as reports from perpetrators or victims, with police data underreporting serious violent incidents as compared to self-reports (Cornish et al., 2025).

Sociopragmatics is very relevant to the illocutionary act of demand/request and its analysis. It is for this theory of production that this paper adopts the idea but perspicuously shows how social context, power relations and cultural norms shape the form and meaning of speech acts, for example, in consumer-driver interactions on the Gojek platform, where social roles determine which entity can be dominant to give commands or to make a demand (Risnawati et al., 2025). Other studies of seller-buyer exchanges, Puspakartika et al editorial staff find, indicate that the directive speech acts, particularly demands, still are a predominant element, and the choice of sentence types (declarative, imperative, or interrogative) are largely determined by social contexts and communicative end.ings.

A sociopragmatic approach identifies speech act types and the presence of demand, as well as the manner of demanding whether directly or indirectly made, as well as factors that influence how a demand is interpreted and responded to (e.g., Trotzke & Reimer, 2023). Moreover, the study of meta-illocution, i.e. how people categorize and talk about, for example, requests, or commands, can also help to uncover the great influence society has on what terms and propositional techniques when it comes to communicating (Schneider, 2022; Schoppa, 2025). Therefore, the sociopragmatic study gives us a deep knowledge of the power relations and communicative strategies and how they operate within diverse social situations, which is indispensable for understanding the meaning and implications of demand statements in our everyday talk.

Question of the Study In the light of the problems identified in the introduction, the research problem of this study is to find an answer to the following question: what are the linguistic forms and sociopragmatic force of the language used in demonstration demand statements? Consistent with this research question, this study aims to explain the types of speech acts and sociopragmatic force of language in democracy-related demand

statements. The results of this study will be greatly useful for raising awareness and improving learners' communication, especially negotiation skill.

LITERATURE REVIEW

While research on the language of social protest in Indonesia is relatively scarce, a number of studies on language variation in wider social settings have offered insight. Research on language variation dynamics in multilingual societies has shown that social change, such as globalization, affects how people use language in their everyday communication, possibly protesting or resisting by changing language use (Batrisyia et al., 2024). These results suggest that language is not merely a medium of communication, but a resistance strategy rooted in broader societal processes.

Apart from globalisation, dialect is similarly influenced as a function of social class. Discrepancies in linguistic usage often mirror one's social stance, but at the same time act as means to expressness/identity or social estrangement (Hayati, 2021). Therefore, language choice in protest areas can be regarded as a reflection of the stratified nature of the Indonesian society, which has shaped communication style.

In addition, the advent of social media has opened up new arenas in which identity, gender identity among them, can be negotiated and performed in a looser way. Studies find that language use on social media tends to be more assertive, sarcastic or definitely challenges traditionalities (Hikmah, 2025). Social media is also an important learning and use space of Indonesian that may reinforce or even change patterns of communication, including in relation to social protest (Budiman, 2022).

However, thus far, no such work is known to have studied the language of social protest explicitly as a special phenomenon in existing research. This, in turn, indicates a demand for further investigations on protest discourse, narratives of resistance, and critical discourse analysis of language in social acts in Indonesia. These endeavors would extend the research and theoretical contexts of sociolinguistics and pragmatics and offer a fuller picture of how language, identity, and social conflict produce each other.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses descriptive qualitative (Creswell, 2017). This choice was based on the fact that the study concentrates on the way in which language, i.e., demand statements, is employed as a vehicle for social advocacy and how the meaning of those demands and their pragmatic force could be understood in demonstration context. In this, the analysis focuses on not only the language in the structure of the sentence, but also what this language does in the recorded socio-political events, as constructed in police reports.

The data used in this study comes from police reports on action events in Indonesia. These records were selected because they represent official evidence of what the protesters demanded and therefore the shape, content, and language used in making these demands. The analytical focus of this study is on the demand statements of demonstrators (in quotes unless otherwise noted or not quoted because not in quotes) as transcribed, quoted, or paraphrased in the police reports.

Sampling was on purposive basis guided by 2 main considerations: (1) police reports clearly stating the demands, (2) the reported demonstration events illustrate the diversity of socio-political issues (e.g. education, labor, environment, politics). This

method guarantees that the gathered data are reliable in the detection of patterns, patterns, language of demands, and variations.

There were various steps of data collection. First, the researchers gained official access to police report files. Second, the authenticity and completeness of each report were verified. In stage 3, sections with demand statements were selected and ordered as unit of analysis. The categories used to categorize the utterance were the illocutionary speech act (directive, representative, commissive), the delivery strategy (direct, indirect, with intensifiers or with mitigation), and the resultant pragmatic force (degree of obligation, urgency, or ultimatum, etc).

Data were analyzed in this study in two ways, namely by the reference equivalence and extralingual equivalence method (Sudaryanto, 2015; Mahsun, 2017). The referential equivalence technique was used to analyze language of demand in the police reports. Meanwhile, the extralingual equivalent technique was utilised to reinforce the linguistic context analysis. The examination of speech acts in social networking sites was carried out from a socio-pragmatic perspective.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings and implications of this study are presented in regard to the form of speech acts and sociopragmatic force. The results show three types of speech acts- directive, assertion, and expressive. Eight sociopragmatic acts were found including: demanding investigation of corruption/illegality/violation; demanding dismissal/removal; demanding accountability/compensation/service improvement; rejection (of development/ project/ policy); expressing opinion/criticism/dissatisfaction; demanding arrest/prosecution/law enforcement; reporting violation; and demanding commitment to political promises/ anti-drug measures. These findings are elaborated below.

Forms of Speech Acts in Demonstration Demand Statements

From the analysis, the most frequent illocutionary speech act is directive (87.18% in general). This shows that the demand utterances in the police reports on demonstrations are directed at controlling, adjuring or requesting what should and should not be done by the addressee/respondent. Grounds acts, on the other hand, are of the least frequency holding only a mere 5.13% this followed by mostly only facts or statements of true by affirming them is the most prevalent forms ofud grounds. Expressive speech acts make 7.69% and the purpose here is more used to express metadiscourse expressing disappointment, dissatisfaction and rejection of certain conditions. Additional information is given in Table 1.

Tabel 1. Distribution of Speech Act Forms in Demonstrations

No.	Type of Illocutionary Act	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Directive	34	87.18
2.	Expressive	3	7.69
3.	Assertive	2	5.13

Total

39

100

According to the table above, distribution of types of illocutionary speech acts in facilitators' demands is shown including 39 requests that were analyzed. Directive speech acts are more prevailing by a percentage equal to 87.18% suggesting that the demands are mainly made to affect the hearer's behaviour (e.g. orders, advices, requests). Only 5.13% of speech acts are including that stating the facts or beliefs (assertive speech acts)and 7.69% for conveying the emotions or attitudes(expressive speech acts). Each of these findings is now discussed in turn.

Directive Speech Acts

Results indicate that directive speech acts greatly outweigh the demand statements from police reports accounting for 87.18%. It is this certainty of purpose that prevails as the leading definitional characteristic of the role of language in demonstrations, the essential purpose of which is to express in no uncertain terms the collective will in the hope of influencing, urging or leaning on the authorities to act. Order form in the directive on the demand statement is mainly done by using form of verb performatives, such as demand, urge, request, reject, which directly represent has speaker intention (Sari & Utomo, 2020). The following data illustrate the forms of directive speech acts.

Copot Burhanudin dari jabatan jaksa agung yang diduga melanggar kode etik profesi dengan melakukan poligami

Konteks Tuntutan: Laporan dugaan poligami Jaksa Agung ST Burhanuddin pernah dilayangkan ke KASN pada 2021, namun segera dicabut dan tidak berlanjut pada pencopotan jabatan.

The expression is a directive speech act that directly performs the illocutionary force of ordering or requesting. Drawing on Searle's (1969)'s speech act theory, orders are designed to bring it about that the addressee will act in a certain way, that is, to make the hearer carry out an action (Austin 1975); the hearer is in this case either a state agency or government as the relevant power to fire a high official. The word "copot" (dismiss/remove) as selected in the lexicon indicates a direct imperativ form and no mitigation, which show that the speaker has a strong and urgent action to perform.

From a sociopragmatic perspective these claims are indicative of the fact that language is used as a tool of conflict. Language is used by protesters to agitate for structural change, namely the firing of the Attorney General, through tight and controlling lexical selections. In addition, the allusion to illicit actions on the code of ethics contributes to the construction of moral rightness and assertiveness of the claims among the public (Prayitno et al., 2022). In this regard, language is not just a vehicle for articulating aspirations; it is a tactical tool to rally social support, pressurising authorities and to amplify common goals.

Expressive Speech Acts

The presence of expressive speech acts — which formed 7.69% — also assumes importance while the data in this research is dominated by directive speech acts. When large groups of people gather they suddenly have a manifestation of group sentiment,

often a disappointment or anger or unhappiness with some government program or some specific social condition. Theaussiennists:16 occurrence Show these events, the discourse of demands functions not only ideationally, inasmuch as it orders or encourages action, but also expressively, as a site where collective feelings are expressed to legitimate the struggle (Diessel & Coventry, 2020). Following are the representative examples of expressive utterances:

Menyikapi perusahaan yang melanggar izin lingkungan dan merusak ekosistem
[Addressing Companies that Violate Environmental Permits and Damage Ecosystems]

Konteks Tuntutan: respons terhadap perusahaan yang melanggar izin lingkungan dan menimbulkan kerusakan ekosistem.

[Context of the Demand: a response to corporations violating environmental permits and causing ecosystem degradation.]

The utterance is an expression type of speech act filled with collective emotion content. This request is not only to report environmental permit violations, but expresses anger, disappointment, and unhappiness about the company's conduct, as something that goes against society and RoE as well (Diessel & Coventry, 2020). In sociopragmatic terms, expressives like these serve both to inform the hearer of the speaker's evaluative position, and to reinforce the moral rightness of the demands that the speaker is making. Language itself is a means of resistance: as people sum up their notion of the collective feelings, they not only express their complaint, but also establish solidarity, reinforce persuasiveness and pressure those in power to make immediate concessions.

Assertive Speech Acts

While the data is dominated by directive speech acts, the 5.15% of assertive speech acts in the data presents its own importance. There are two forms of TAs used in demand statements; factual assertion, claim, and statement of belief that are used to justify the legitimacy of demonstrators' demands and here are called assertives. Data next indicate the presence of assertive speech acts.

Indonesia Gelap : TUT Wuri Efisiensi

[Dark Indonesia: Tut Wuri Efficiency]

Konteks Tuntutan: kritik terhadap kondisi krisis listrik/energi di Indonesia dengan menyindir jargon pendidikan "Tut Wuri Handayani" untuk menyoroti ironi efisiensi yang justru berdampak pada kegelapan atau keterbatasan akses.

[Context of Demand: A critique of Indonesia's electricity and energy crisis, employing an ironic reference to the educational motto "Tut Wuri Handayani" to underscore the paradox of efficiency measures that instead result in darkness and limited access.]

The expression is affirmation and an indictment of the social conditions that we live in. Pragmatically, this illocutionary action not only informs but also supports the opinion that Indonesia is in a "dark" condition where it is ambiguous, adversity and crisis. The "TUT Wuri Efisiensi" sentence is sarcastically used for efficient or purportedly efficient measures that appear to make bad situation worse, especially in education and other governmental policies which are judged not good for the people (Toan, 2024). On a

sociopragmatic level, this is a gentle but effective strategy of resistance. Protesters assert social truths in the form of claims against political authorities and, at the same time, give birth to counter-narratives to those promoted by the government.

Sociopragmatic Force of Demonstration Demands

Eight types of sociopragmatic force were found in the demonstrators' demands. These are: (1) reports of corruption/ illegality/ violations, (2) demand for dismissal/ removal from position, (3) demand for accountability/compensation/ improvement of services, (4) rejection of development projects or policies, (5) attitudes/ criticism/ dissatisfaction, (6) demand for arrest/trial/ law enforcement, (7) reports of violation, and (8) demand for keeping the political promise or anti- narcotics campaign. More details are presented in the table below.

Tabel 2. Sociopragmatic Force of Protest Demand Statements

No.	Category of Social Function	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Demanding investigation of corruption/illegality/violations	19	48.72
2.	Demanding dismissal/removal from office	7	17.95
3.	Demanding accountability/compensation/service improvement	4	10.26
4.	Rejecting development/projects/policies	3	7.69
5.	Expressing stance/criticism/dissatisfaction	3	7.69
6.	Demanding arrest/trial/law enforcement	1	2.56
7.	Reporting violations	1	2.56
8.	Demanding commitment to political promises/anti-narcotics agenda	1	2.56
Total		39	100

From the statistic in the above table, it can be seen that the most dominant social function of language in the statement of demand is ordering or asking for investigations into corruption, illegality or violation, which represents 48.72 % of the total. This would suggest that matters of morality and justice are at the fore of the minds of the protesters. The second kind is the demand for dismissal or ousting of officials (17.95%), and, then, the demand for responsibility taken, through payment of damages, or practical service improvement is posted at 10.26%. On the other hand, against development plans or policy's rejection and stance, criticism or unsatisfied 7.69% share other. Less frequent categories are calls for arrest or repression, reports of violations, and calls for political or anti-drug repentance, each one with 2.56%. These results show that the language of demands in protests is primarily concentrated in pressuring the government to apply the

law and to fight corruption, and that other social demands are considered here as secondary issues. The interpretation of each finding is summarized below.

Demanding Investigations into Corruption, Illegality, or Violations

The results show that "Investigation: Any corruption/ illegality/ violation of the Law" dominates the data with 48.72% of the utterances. This prominence indicates that one of the fundamental orientations of language in demonstrators' demand statements is to push authorities to reveal and take action against cases that are perceived to be against the public interest (Miranda et al., 2021). Below are some of these demands that have made headlines.

Usut tuntas dugaan pertambangan ilegal oleh PT. Gema Kreasi Perdana terkait eksploitasi nikel di pulau wawoni sulawesi

[Conduct a thorough investigation into the alleged illegal mining activities by PT Gema Kreasi Perdana related to nickel exploitation on Wawonii Island, Sulawesi]

Konteks Tuntutan: mengusut tuntas dugaan pertambangan ilegal yang dilakukan PT Gema Kreasi Perdana dalam eksploitasi nikel di Pulau Wawonii, Sulawesi.

[Demand Context: conducting a thorough investigation into the alleged illegal mining activities carried out by PT Gema Kreasi Perdana in the exploitation of nickel on Wawonii Island, Sulawesi.]

It represents a particular directive speech act with a rich sociopragmatic force, since it involves a collective request for the police to investigate immediately against perceived illegal practices. "Usut Tuntas" Lexical choice "usut tuntas" (thoroughly investigate) flags the demand with an indication of uncompromising positioning, as well as a moral imperative calling for justice (Vilaça, 2024). In sociopragmatic terms, the utterance does two things: It presses the authorities to act, and it legitimizes the community's struggle against the overbearing exploitation of the region's resources. In this case, language is used as a tool of resistance, as by formulating such calls demonstrators cast themselves like a kind of social watchdog, as guardians of environmental rights, denouncing the corruption and illegality that impact on the general population.

Demanding Dismissal/Removal from Office

Calls for dismissal/removal is another type of speech act that makes up a large proportion of our data which corresponds to 17.95% of the total demands. And the existence of such a statement is itself a testament to the fact that protests are not simply about voicing broad demands but are also about applying pressure to specific people or offices that are judged to have fallen short of meeting their public duty (López-Espino, 2024). The sociopragmatic force of such dismissal requests is evident in the following line of data.

Copot Burhanudin dari jabatan jaksa agung yang diduga melanggar kode etik profesi dengan melakukan poligami

[Dismiss Burhanudin from his position as Attorney General for allegedly violating the professional code of ethics by engaging in polygamy.]

Konteks Tuntutan: Laporan dugaan poligami Jaksa Agung ST Burhanuddin pernah dilayangkan ke KASN pada 2021, namun segera dicabut dan tidak berlanjut pada pencopotan jabatan.

[Context of the Demand: A report concerning the alleged polygamy of Attorney General ST Burhanuddin was submitted to the State Civil Apparatus Commission (KASN) in 2021, but it was promptly withdrawn and did not result in dismissal from office.]

The illocutionary force of the utterance is a directive speech act with sociopragmatic force for impeachment. The word *copot* (dismiss) there makes a direct and imperative demand in order to show the will of the mass to force the authorities to be active. The direct reference to the official post and the justification for this derogatory code violation enhance both the legitimacy of the request and the delegitimization of the addressee (Joullié et al., 2021). This is where language becomes a weapon of struggle—not only an affective means by which to emote, or to deliberately stir up outrage, but as a strategy of resistance and power, a way of orchestrating public opinion and forcing institutions to bend to the will of the many.

Demanding Accountability/Compensation/Service Improvement

The sociopragmatic value of calling for a blame, compensation, or service-improvement account is indicative of language as an instrument of struggle aimed at getting authorities to acknowledge their part in the errors or incompetence they allowed to happen. Expressions of this type do not just express complaints but also posit public rights and promote concrete remedies (Pérez-Durán & Hernández-Sánchez, 2025). And so language functions as a mechanism of social discipline, linking social ambitions and institutional duties. The following are some examples of such utterances, which have the sociopragmatic force of calling for accountability.

Meminta pertanggung jawaban atas kerugian masyarakat Ds. Kasang lopak alai muaro jambi atas pengeboran proyek

[Demanding accountability for the losses suffered by the community of Kasang Lopak Alai Village, Muaro Jambi, due to the drilling project.]

Konteks Tuntutan: Laporan ini berkonteks pada tuntutan pertanggungjawaban terhadap kerugian yang dialami masyarakat Desa Kasang Lopak Alai, Muaro Jambi, akibat aktivitas pengeboran proyek.

[Context of the Demand: This report is situated within the demand for accountability regarding the losses suffered by the community of Kasang Lopak Alai Village, Muaro Jambi, as a result of drilling activities associated with the project.]

The utterance is a directive illocutionary act with a very high sociopragmatic force, that of demanding explanation. This act of speech-borne complaint does not represent a pure sign of the times, but it denotes a further demand for those responsible for the drill to rectify themselves by offering an explanation, monetary recompense, or other forms of service improvement in proportion to the losses suffered by the community (Antonopoulos et al., 2020). In sociopragmatic terms, this illocutionary force is a power relation such that the community constitutes the weaker side and the institution or company is the side that is held responsible. The language in this sentence serves as a tool of a collective struggle, because, in the articulation of these demands, citizens not only articulate their pain, but, also, assert their negotiating power with respect to their demand

for justice and preservation of rights. Furthermore, the use of the term “demanding accountability” also has moral and legal justifiability: it suggests that one person’s one harm is not just that person’s private harm but a social injury that deserves structural response. So, the language of demand functions politically as a pragmatic force that intimidates its power into the addressee, but it also mobilizes the community’s togetherness to defend themselves for their rights of compensation and better public services.

Rejecting Development/Projects/Policies

The socio-pragmatic value of refusing development, projects or policies mirrors in the resulting claims made by demonstrators, which delegitimize public authority or institutional decisions. That rejection was not just about flagging disagreement, but rather a collective strategy of refusal made manifest in confrontational speech, aimed at generating forms of resistance, solidarity, and pressure on authorities to cease or alter deemed harmful policies for society (Cushing, 2020). The sociopragmatic force of refusing development The data below demonstrate the sociopragmatic force of rejecting development.

Menolak Dirut Bulog dari TNI Aktif

[Rejecting the Appointment of the President Director of Bulog from Active Military Officers]

Konteks Tuntutan: penolakan publik atau kelompok tertentu terhadap pengangkatan Direktur Utama Bulog yang berasal dari perwira TNI aktif

[Context of the Demand: public or specific group rejection of the appointment of the President Director of Bulog originating from an active military officer (TNI).]

The utterance is a directive illocution which negative-instances the policy of appointing current military personnel to the position. From the socio pragmatic point of view, the concept of rejecting serves as an instrument of opposition indicating not only disagreement but also a demand, on behalf of the rejecting, to reverse the decision. This is when we see language as a struggle at work as it creates resistance and collective solidarity in a concise and straightforward way and in doing so putting pressure on the government (Weinberg, 2021). So the language of rejection not only is aspirational, but also has pragmatic force, to mobilize emotions, to build a movement identity and to intrude upon the policy arena.

Expressing Attitude/Criticism/Dissatisfaction

Acts of speaking expressing attitude, criticism and dissatisfaction are powerful sociopragmatic acts in the sense that speakers do not merely say out the emotions of a group but also sociopragmatically build social pressure on the intended on the addressee. In this sense, through expressions of discontent, speakers reiterate their defiant position against the ruling authority, strengthen mass unity, and legitimize the moral imperative that enhances the force of demands in the confrontational discourse (Khan et al., 2025). The latter data are examples of the sociopragmatic force of expressing criticism.

Menyikapi perusahaan yang melanggar izin lingkungan dan merusak ekosistem

[Addressing Companies that Violate Environmental Permits and Damage Ecosystems]

Konteks Tuntutan: respons terhadap perusahaan yang tidak mematuhi izin lingkungan dan menyebabkan kerusakan ekosistem.

[Context of the Demand: a response to companies that fail to comply with environmental permits and cause ecosystem degradation.]

The utterance reflects the sociopragmatic force of expressing attitude, criticism, and dissatisfaction. This expression signifies the demonstrators' firm stance against corporate practices perceived as detrimental to the public interest. Pragmatically, the utterance functions to criticize as well as to condemn actions that violate regulations, while socially it reinforces the moral legitimacy of collective struggle by demonstrating concern for the environment (Zhou et al., 2020). Thus, language is employed not merely to convey information, but also as an instrument of resistance to pressure authorities into immediate action.

Demanding Arrest/Prosecution/Law Enforcement

Calls for people to be arrested, charged or policed are the type of demands common in protest movements. These expressions indicate the common desire in society to exert pressure on the police to take swift action on the guilty (Uwen, 2023). (A sociopragmatic standpoint) the expression as a use of language to be the weapon of the fight and a void of demand, where the social tension could be excreted through a formal expression. The below metrics show this sociopragmatic potency of calling for arrest, prosecution, and policing.

Tangkap dan adili pelaku pemukulan kader HMI, Pecat dan penjarakan Menteri ESDM, Tolak Persekusi Preman Bayaran pada Kader HMI

[Arrest and prosecute the perpetrators of the assault on HMI cadres; dismiss and imprison the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources; reject the persecution of HMI cadres by hired thugs.]

Konteks Tuntutan: tuntutan publik yang menyoroti kasus kekerasan terhadap kader HMI dengan mendesak penegakan hukum, pemecatan pejabat, serta penolakan terhadap praktik persekusi oleh pihak tertentu.

[Context of Demands: Public demands highlighting the case of violence against HMI cadres by urging law enforcement, calling for the dismissal of officials, and rejecting acts of persecution perpetrated by certain parties.]

By the complete utterance a degree of directive speech act is given that is very sociopragmatically strong. Imperative verb structures are impelling and obligating demands and are directly communicated to both the law enforcement officers and state bodies: arrest, prosecute, dismiss, imprison. The sociopragmatic value of this statement is not just the expression of an ideal but also using the force of language to force the authorities to cross the hump and accelerate the action according to law, prohibiting acts which deserved to be described as violation and corruption against certain actor. Moreover, these requests demonstrate language as a tool of collective struggle: language is used to stake a bargaining position, express grievances, and through the use of the same language as the oppressor, construct a discourse of resistance to abnormal practices of power. In this respect, the utterance holds not only as a form of communication, but also as a symbolic means of social and political opposition (Greenwald & Daniels, 2024).

In this sense, language is a weapon used in the struggle, since through these demands, demonstrators are trying to change things through informing arrests, prosecution, dismissal of state officials and also advancement of the movement's members' who have been operated by violence.

Reporting Violations

The sociopragmatic impact of reporting violations deals with how language can be "weaponized in order to divulge activities that one finds to be deviant or harmful. in the context of demonstrations, this force serves to reinforce the justification of demand and at the same time it gives moral support to common action by virtue of demonstrating connections to concrete issues needing follow up from the authorities. The sociopragmatic force of reporting violations is mostly closely shown in the data below.

Melaporkan dugaan pelanggaran yang dilakukan rektor UNSRAT Manado

[Reporting alleged violations committed by the Rector of UNSRAT Manado.]

Konteks Melaporkan: penyampaian dugaan pelanggaran yang dituduhkan kepada Rektor Universitas Sam Ratulangi (UNSRAT) Manado

[Reporting Context: the disclosure of alleged violations attributed to the Rector of Sam Ratulangi University (UNSRAT) Manado.]

As an utterance, it has a sociopragmatic value that serves as a tool of legitimation and collective resistance. Pragmatically speaking, this statement is a member of the speech act type of directiveness, directed at a higher body in order for them to agree or act upon the legal report. The term "alleged violation" serves to emphasize that there are legal and ethical prepossessions that have been violated. Accordingly, language intuit language thus does not only communicate information but also creates moral and institutional pressure on the addressee (Joullié et al., 2021). The description of the shake is an example of how language is used to construct discourse that fortifies the speaker's identity as a public watchdog and fosters social trust while also holding authorities accountable. Therefore, language is instrumental in this struggle, linking public demands and formal legal devices at the moment of reporting.

Demanding Commitment to Political Promises/Anti-Narcotics

This utterance has to do with a request of a political/promise demand/anti-narcotics and evidences the force in sociopragmatic of language mediation as a control and social conflict. The verb "demand" denotes clear intent to force the addressee—political actors or policymakers—to stick to what they officially agreed. Socially, on the other hand, this statement is more than just a verbal statement, it is a social device that society has resorted to in order to exercise its political accountability and promote and address an agenda matter of life and death: Security and Drug Dealing (Arias Álvarez, 2024). The above statistics indicate the sociopragmatic value carried in the act of demanding loyalty.

Meminta Presiden Prabowo untuk berkomitmen terhadap janji-janji kampanyenya, yaitu membumi hanguskan peredaran narkoba dengan menginstruksikan kepada kemenkumham agar segera copot oknum-oknum yang melakukan tindakan melawan hukum yang ada di rutan salemba dan menginstruksikan kepada Kapolri untuk meninjau proses hukum yang dilakukan oleh Polres Jakarta Pusat terhadap Ammar Zoni.

[Requesting President Prabowo to uphold his campaign promises, particularly the eradication of drug trafficking, by instructing the Ministry of Law and Human Rights to immediately dismiss individuals involved in unlawful practices at Salemba detention center, and directing the National Police Chief to review the legal process conducted by the Central Jakarta Police against Ammar Zoni.]

Konteks Tuntutan: tuntutan publik agar Presiden Prabowo menepati janji kampanye pemberantasan narkoba dengan menindak oknum aparat di Rutan Salemba dan mengevaluasi penanganan kasus Ammar Zoni oleh Polres Jakarta Pusat.

[Context of Demands: Public demands for President Prabowo to fulfill his campaign pledge on eradicating narcotics by taking firm action against corrupt law enforcement officers at Salemba Detention Center and reviewing the handling of the Ammar Zoni case by the Central Jakarta Police.]

Through the sound of that words, we can perceive that language is a weapon of fight. It is, on a pragmatic assumption, an imperative speech act with which the highest state authority is to be pressured to implement its political treatment. 77), from a sociopragmatic perspective, the force of the utterance is not only exerted in making a request; it transcends into a game of collective confrontation that seeks to obtain a concrete effect, that is, the disappearance of drug abuse through the action of the institutions. Lexical selections such as "annihilate," "immediately dismiss," and "get back to the legal process" suggest illocutionary force Searle (1969) which lays on a sense of urgency and moral responsibility to language as a mechanism of holding political leaders to their public promises (Kalmoe, 2014). It is like this: it transcends the expressive use of language, which is not enough to just affirm dreams and desires, but instead art now serves as the cause tool, one that right uproots the interests of the public, limits the impositions of power and people who put their word into promises conduit them into practice.

CONCLUSION

It is of note from the analysis that directive illocutionary acts are the most frequent type of protest demands inserted in police reports, amounting up to 34 occurrences or 87.18%. This result supports the notion that in the context of demos language typically emerges as a collective weapon in the struggle for setting pressure, direction and orientation to the institutions vis-à-vis the voiced aspirations of the public. The predominance of directives reflects the pragmatic function of the language of protest, which is designed not just to express opinion or information, but to elicit specific response from the addressee.

Less frequent expressive speech acts (7.69%) and assertive speech acts (5.13%) are no less important. They provide a language for the expression of shared emotions of frustration or repudiation, helping to reinforce moral claims that underpin the collective action. And assertives, in turn, are used to make assertions in general about facts or social reality that justify the demands. These two categories combined contribute to the pragmatic force of imperatives and make certain that the command is not just imperative, but also reinforced by argumentation and emotions.

As to social function, most demands pertain to inquiry (corruption; illegality; or violation of law per 48.72%) followed by the demands for removal (or ouster per 17.95%), and accountability, compensation, and service or program improvement (per 10.26%). This pattern suggests that the language of protest demands is very much focused on righting perceived abuses of power, and in seeking for legal as well as moral retaliation for political or institutional actors. There is also a description for rejecting projects or policies (7.69%) or expressing opinions, criticism or dissatisfaction (7.69%) which indicates to the use of language to resist (e.g., when demonstrators created opponents to specific policies or situations). Less common but still notable are more specific actions that call for arrests, a register of the offences, or political engagement, lending a more granular sense of the variety of issues under dispute.

In conclusion, these results confirm that language in protest demands is a tool of social struggle possessing sophisticated pragmatic power. Directives are the principal means of exponents of collective pressure, expressives are reinforcing emotional solidarity and assertives are arguing for legitimacy. They coalesce to shape a narrative of struggle as an influence not just to bring institutional pressures to bear, but to craft compelling moral and social narratives. This highlights that in the language of protest, words serve not just as a medium of communication but as a symbolic weapon in the service of justice, accountability, and social change.

REFERENCE

- Antonopoulos, I., Robu, V., Couraud, B., Kirli, D., Norbu, S., Kiprakis, A., Flynn, D., Elizondo-Gonzalez, S., & Wattam, S. (2020). Artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches to energy demand-side response: A systematic review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.109899>
- Arias Álvarez, A. (2024). Linguistic landscapes of activism: The fight for a quality public healthcare in Madrid. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 23(6), 896–919.
- Batrisyia, A., Putri Nabila, M., Siringoringo, N. D., & Hasanah Harahap, S. (2024). Dinamika Variasi Bahasa dalam Kerangka Sociolinguistik terhadap Analisis Faktor-faktor Sosial dalam Perubahan Bahasa di Masyarakat Multibahasa pada Era Globalisasi. *Journal on Education*, 6(4), 21448–21454.
- Budiman, B. (2022). Pemanfaatan Media Sosial sebagai Media Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia. *EUNOIA (Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia)*, 2(2), 149–156.
- Cornish, R. P., Teyhan, A., Tilling, K., Macleod, J., & Brennan, I. (2025). Measuring serious violence perpetration: comparison of police-recorded and self-reported data in a UK cohort. *International Journal of Population Data Science*, 10(1), 1–16.
- Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Cushing, I. (2020). Power, policing, and language policy mechanisms in schools: A response to Hudson. *Language in Society*, 49(3), 461–475. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740452000038X>
- Diessel, H., & Coventry, K. R. (2020). Demonstratives in Spatial Language and Social

- Interaction: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(November), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.555265>
- Donatz-Fest, Isabelle. (2024). The ‘doings’ behind data: An ethnography of police data construction. *Big Data & Society*, 11(3), 20539517241270696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517241270695>
- Finch, B. K., Thomas, K., Beck, A. N., Burghart, D. B., Klinger, D., & Johnson, R. R. (2022). Assessing Data Completeness, Quality, and Representativeness of Justifiable Homicides in the FBI’s Supplementary Homicide Reports: A Research Note. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 38(1), 267–293. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-021-09493-x>
- Greenwald, M. L., & Daniels, D. E. (2024). When adults with speech-language impairment meet law enforcement: A qualitative analysis of client experiences. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 112, 106471. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2024.106471>
- Güss, C. D., Tuason, M. T., & Devine, A. (2020). Problems With Police Reports as Data Sources: A Researchers’ Perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(October), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.582428>
- Hasfi, Nurul, Pednekar-Magal, Vandana, Rimban, Luz, Sunarto, Sunarto, & Yusriana, Amida. (2024). Digital dissent: How Indonesian and Filipino journalists converge with virtual communities to face state repression. *Global Media and Communication*, 20(3), 329–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17427665241288949>
- Hayati, R. (2021). Variasi Bahasa Dan Kelas Sosial. *Pena Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Dan Teknologi*, 35(1), 48. <https://doi.org/10.31941/jurnalpena.v35i1.1348>
- Healey, P. G. T., Khare, P., Castro, I., Tyson, G., Karan, M., Shekhar, R., McQuistin, S., Perkins, C., & Purver, M. (2023). Power and vulnerability: managing sensitive language in organizational communication. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14(1987). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1266425>
- Hikmah, E. F. (2025). Bahasa sebagai Identitas Gender: Studi Kasus Penggunaan Bahasa di Media Sosial X. *SeBaSa*, 8(1), 210–223.
- House, J., Kádár, D. Z., Todorović, T., Klemenčič, M., Hazemali, D., Onič, T., & Plemenitaš, K. (2024). Capturing power in diplomatic language use: The case of a closed-door mediatory negotiation and its aftermath during the breakup of the former Yugoslavia. *Journal of Language and Politics*, December.
- Joullié, J.-E., Gould, A. M., Spillane, R., & Luc, S. (2021). The language of power and authority in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(4), 101491. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101491>
- Kalmoe, N. P. (2014). Fueling the Fire: Violent Metaphors, Trait Aggression, and Support for Political Violence. *Political Communication*, 31(4), 545–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2013.852642>
- Khan, M., Mowbray, P. K., & Wilkinson, A. (2025). Forging New Voice Mechanisms From a Crisis—Employee Voice on Social Media During COVID-19. *Human*

- Resource Management Journal*, 35(3), 713–727.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12591>
- Lacina, J., & Griffith, R. (2021). The Power of Language. *Reading Teacher*, 74(5), 481–482. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1996>
- López-Espino, J. (2024). Giving and Taking Voice: Metapragmatic Dismissals of Parents in Child Welfare Court Cases. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 49(3), 1453–1478. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/lsi.2023.50>
- Mahsun. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan Strategi Metode dan Tekniknya*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Miranda, A., Lasman, D., & Putri, A. (2021). Political Language of Young People on the Demonstration of September 24, 2019. *Struktural*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.30-12-2020.2311263>
- Parker, S. T. (2022). Measuring gun violence in police data sources: transitioning to NIBRS. *Injury Epidemiology*, 9(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40621-022-00376-8>
- Pérez-Durán, I., & Hernández-Sánchez, A. (2025). General and Substantive Accountability in Nursing Home Services: Assessing Messages from the Demand Side and the Supply Side. *Journal of Aging and Social Policy*, 37(1), 26–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2024.2348964>
- Prayitno, H. J., Markhamah, Nasucha, Y., Huda, M., Ratih, K., Ubaidullah, Rohmadi, M., Boeriswati, E., & Thambu, N. (2022). Prophetic educational values in the Indonesian language textbook: pillars of positive politeness and character education. *Heliyon*, 8(8), e10016. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10016>
- Risnawati, E., Gunawan, W., Fatinova, D., Kurniawan, M. A., Setyawan, H., & Mubarak, Y. (2025). Power Reflections in the Illocutionary Acts of Consumers and Drivers in the Indonesian Context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 15(2), 624–634. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1502.32>
- Sari, D. N., & Utomo, A. P. Y. (2020). Directive speech act in President Joko Widodo's speech related to handling coronavirus (Covid-19) in Indonesia (Pragmatic review). *Journal of Social Studies (JSS)*, 16(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jss.v16i1.32072>
- Schade, S., & Thielgen, M. M. (2022). Commentary: Problems With Police Reports as Data Sources: A Researchers' Perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(June), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.873235>
- Schneider, K. P. (2022). Referring to Speech Acts in Communication: Exploring Meta-Illocutionary Expressions in ICE-Ireland. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 6(2), 155–174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-022-00123-w>
- Schoppa, D. J. (2025). What the meta-illocutionary lexicon can tell us about speech act taxonomies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 237, 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.01.002>

- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Act: An Essay on the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Setiawan, K. M. P., & Tomsa, D. (2023). Defending a Vulnerable yet Resilient Democracy: Civil Society Activism in Jokowi's Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 42(3), 350–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034231209058>
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Trotzke, A., & Reimer, L. A. U. R. A. (2023). Comprehending non-canonical and indirect speech acts in German. *Journal of Linguistics*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226723000336>
- Uwen, G. (2023). Objection Overruled: Language Dynamics and Power Relations in Courtroom Interactions. *Language Matters*, 54(2), 21–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2023.2229533>
- Vilaça, L. (2024). A Social Movement Model for Judicial Behavior: Evidence from Brazil's Anti-Corruption Movements. *Social Forces*, 103(1), 223–244. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soae065>
- Wahyuningroem, S. L., Sirait, R., Uljanatunnisa, U., & Heryadi, D. (2024). Youth political participation and digital movement in Indonesia: the case of #ReformasiDikorupsi and #TolakOmnibusLaw. *F1000Research*, 12, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.122669.3>
- Weinberg, M. (2021). Scale-making, power and agency in arbitrating school-level language planning decisions. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 22(1–2), 59–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2020.1741207>
- Wischermann, J., Dang, T. V. P., & Sirait, G. M. (2023). The State in a Capitalist Society: Protests and State Reactions in Vietnam and Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 53(2), 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2022.2038235>
- Zhou, J., Zheng, Y., & Tai, J. H.-M. (2020). Grudges and gratitude: the social-affective impacts of peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(3), 345–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1643449>